

## Meeting Summary

eHealth Technical Working Group  
March 10, 2010 11:00AM-12:30PM

### Quorum

Quorum was achieved.

### Approval of Meeting Summaries

Members were asked if anyone did not feel prepared to approve the meeting summaries that had been sent out to the group over the past week. No one indicated that this was the case. Rim Cothren made the motion, which Lee Mosbrucker seconded, to approve the meeting summaries that had been circulated, which included those through 2/17/10. There being no objections, the summaries were approved.

### Issue Tracker

Scott Cebula introduced a new Issue Tracker spreadsheet tool, which the co-chairs and Walter have assembled to track the issues needing resolution that arise from workgroup meetings and other discussions. The idea of the tool is to provide a consolidated record of the issues and memorialize the decisions made with respect to those issues as they are resolved. Additionally, the tool will help to track when particular issues have been referred to TAC or other responsible persons.

There were no comments or suggestions from participants about the Issue Tracker.

The group then began reviewing the issues in the spreadsheet sequentially. The following is a summarization of substantive discussion and/or comments regarding these issues. *(Please see the Issue Tracker spreadsheet for a detailed description of the issues discussed.)*

### Issue 1: What architecture will be used for medication reconciliation?

- Rim noted that the implicit decision from discussions within TWG was that medication reconciliation would be handled best as an application-level issue, and as such would not require any explicit provisions within the technical architecture. Additionally, TAC's more recent prioritization of meaningful use functions places e-prescribing as a low priority to support through shared services.
- Tim added that in absence of architectural support, considerable costs will be incurred at the endpoints to provide complex medication reconciliation functionality.
- Several participants, including Scott Cebula, Rim Cothren, Anthony Stever, and Lee Mosbrucker, supported the statement that while the architecture does not explicitly support application-level functionality, neither does it preclude the subsequent development and use of an application that provides such functionality.
- **Scott Cebula motioned and Anthony Stever seconded that Issue 1 be closed, given that medication reconciliation is not intended to be part of the architecture at this time. There being no objections, the motion was passed.**

### Issue 2: Should HIE core services be required to access other state HIE shared services?

- Rim felt that since the core services are meant to establish a trust framework, their use to access non-core services may be a requirement. However, this will become more apparent once the nature of these non-core services is made clear by TAC.

- Anthony Stever felt that more concrete scenarios would be necessary in order to more fully understand how to answer the question. Rim mentioned that the business requirements that TAC is in the process of creating for non-core services will inform such scenarios.
- Scott Cebula suggested that the issue remain open until further input from TAC is made available in the next few weeks. Jeff Evoy agreed with this suggestion.
- **The status of Issue 2 was changed to “Open”, and TAC was added as a responsible party in the spreadsheet.**

Issue 3: Should all entities be required to be entered into the statewide registry, so that they are known and reachable by the state HIE infrastructure?

- Members of the group felt that this is a policy/governance question, as opposed to a technical one. Furthermore, the answer to the question will not have an effect on the architecture.
- **Scott Cebula moved, and Rim Cothren seconded, that Issue 3 be closed and referred to TAC. There being no objections, the motion passed.**

Issue 4: How can the function and the governance of the group be improved?

- Scott mentioned that the recommended steps laid out from the 1/6 meeting have been taken, with the exception of creating a roadmap, which is called out as a separate issue in the Issue Tracker.
- Rim felt that improvements had been made in the engagement and participation of the members of the group, pointing to improved communication and achievement of quorum at today's call.
- **Walter will ensure that Jonah is aware of the changes and approves of them.**
- **Scott Cebula motioned, and Rim Cothren seconded, that Issue 4 remain open, pending word of Jonah's approval of the changes made. There being no objections, the motion passed.**
- Note: a new issue was opened in the Issue Tracker pertaining to what the role of TWG and TAC will be beyond March 31, given the recent appointment of the Governance Entity.

Issue 5: Create a roadmap of the design process.

- This task had been suggested in response to the need for a more defined plan for how to move through the design of the technical architecture. The design process having now been more clearly established in conjunction with clarification of the roles of TAC and TWG, and the draft technical architecture having been produced, participants felt that creating a roadmap of the design process at this point would simply be for historical reasons and would be of limited value.
- **Scott Cebula motioned, and Anthony Stever seconded, that Issue 5 be closed. There being no objections, the motion passed.**

Issue 6: How should trust, identity, and authentication be addressed?

- Rim recalled that this had been discussed during an in-depth conversation between Tim, Walter, and himself to clarify the approach that would be taken with respect to authentication, authorization, and identity management based on the architecture. He suggested that the issue remain open and discussion deferred until a written summary of the current approach could be produced.
- **Tim volunteered to create a written summary by the next meeting of how the architecture addresses these issues to facilitate discussion/closure of this issue by the group.**

Issue 7: What protocol should be used for transport?

- The IFR on standards and certification released by ONC includes both SOAP and REST as acceptable mechanisms for web services. NHIN will continue to support SOAP 1.2, while the newly announced NHIN Direct will likely support REST. The decision before the committee is whether to specify a single standard for transport, or to leave it unspecified as it is in the draft architecture (which is consistent with ONC's approach). This is part of a larger question of whether the state architecture should specify/promote a set of exchange standards to be used in support of various exchange patterns.
- The decision will also be influenced by the requirements of any state agencies for the use of one mechanism over the other. Further research in this area is needed before the question of what protocol to specify (if any) can be answered.
- **The group decided to leave the issue open until additional information to guide the discussion further is available.**

Issue 8: Should state HIE services help providers achieve HIE when no other HIE resources available (or they choose not to use other HIE resources)?

- Scott Cebula suggested that this question is a policy issue best addressed by TAC. The answer to the question does not have bearing on the technical architecture. Anthony Stever and Rim Cothren agreed with this assessment.
- **Rim moved, and Jeff Evoy seconded, that the issue be closed and referred to TAC, as it does not affect the technical architecture. There being no objections, the motion passed.**

Issue 9: [Duplicate of Issue 2; closed]

- No discussion needed.

Issue 10: Should a principal that has indicated support for one or more transaction types in the Provider Directory Service be required to support the specified standards-based "common protocol" for each of those transaction types?

- This question is similar in nature to Issue 7 in that more information is needed to formulate an appropriate answer. **There were no objections to leaving the issue open for future discussion.**
- Anthony Stever noted that when this issue is addressed, TWG will need to define the technical component of the question, while deferring any policy-related issues to TAC.

Issue 11: Should the architecture document address certain methods needed for the Entity Registry Service?

- This issue pertains to the question of who will perform provisioning, credentials management, enforcement of policies, and dispute resolution related to identity management.
- There being no clear technical ramifications to this issue, Tim Andrews suggested that the question be referred to TAC.
- **Anthony Stever moved, and Rim Cothren seconded, that the issue be closed and referred to TAC for consideration. There being no objections, the motion passed.**

Issue 12: Will Medi-Cal/Medicaid require direct authentication of individual providers, rather than allowing trusted certificates from an intermediary?

- According to Tim Andrews' HIE experience in other states, Medicaid may or may not accept authentication with third-party certificates. New York Medicaid insisted upon direct authentication, while Tennessee accepted certificates from an intermediary.

- Rim noted that the current MITA standard being promoted by CMS includes assertion of authentication that contains the login ID and password in the message associated with the provider for the targeted Medicaid system. Thus, disallowance of third party authentication has been part of the promoted MITA standard. However, the NHIN standard for this transaction (recently demonstrated at HIMSS) accepts third-party certificates.
- The answer to this question may have ramifications on the technical architecture, i.e. whether support for individual-level authentication is needed to meet Medi-Cal requirements.
- Peter Hung recollected a conversation that occurred on a TWG call with Kim Ortiz on this issue. At the time, Medi-Cal appeared to be open in principle to the possibility of accepting authentication based on the proposed system-level trust framework.
- **Ben Word volunteered to follow up with Kim Ortiz and David Bass on the issue of Medi-Cal authentication requirements and report back to the group at the next meeting.**
- **Anthony Stever motioned and Rim Cothren seconded that the issue remain open and that the research task be delegated to Ben Word. There being no objections, the motion passed.**

#### Input for HIE Summit Meeting

- Walter invited TWG members to provide any input they might have regarding the Operational Plan to be discussed at the upcoming HIE Summit Meeting. There being no comments during the call, Walter asked that any feedback be emailed to himself or the co-chairs prior to the meeting.
- There will be two working sessions for workgroups to resolve open issues pertaining to the operational plan. It was noted that because of logistics, the two breakout sessions will not have coverage by webcast or phone. However the rest of the meeting will be broadcast via web and phone.

#### Summary of Key Questions/Issues/Decision Points:

- Issues that need to be addressed by TWG are now being tracked using an Issue Tracker spreadsheet tool.
- The following issues have now been closed: 1, 3, 5, 8, and 11.
- TWG believes that Issues 3, 8, and 11 are appropriate questions for TAC to consider.

#### Next Steps:

- The Issue Tracker will be updated to reflect the action items and decisions made during the call.
- Walter will ensure that Jonah is aware and supportive of the recent TWG process changes.
- Tim Andrews will provide a written summary of the architectural approach to authentication, authorization, and identity management by the 3/17 meeting.
- Ben Word will follow up with Kim Ortiz and David Bass on the issue of Medi-Cal requirements for provider authentication by the 3/17 meeting.
- Scott Cebula will prioritize the additional issues in the Issue Tracker to be discussed at the next meeting.
- The HIE Summit Meeting will be held on 3/11 in Santa Ana, CA. Members are encouraged to submit feedback regarding the Operational Plan to Walter or the co-chairs prior to the meeting.
- Next TWG meeting is scheduled for 3/17 11AM-12:30PM.

Members Present

| <b>Name</b>           | <b>Organization</b>                            |
|-----------------------|--|
| Jane Brown            | Nautilus Healthcare Management Group           |
| Scott Cebula          | Independent                                    |
| Scott Christman       | CA Dept. of Public Health                      |
| Paul Collins          | CA Dept. of Public Health                      |
| Robert("Rim") Cothren | Cognosante, Inc.                               |
| Jeff Evoy             | Sharp Community Medical Group                  |
| Lee Mosbrucker        | CA Office of the Chief Information Officer     |
| Eileen Moscaritolo    | CalOptima                                      |
| Jeff Newman           | CA Business, Transportation and Housing Agency |
| Steve Saunders        | LA County Dept. of Health Services             |
| Anthony Stever        | AWS Consulting / Redwood MedNet                |
| Ben Word              | CA Dept. of Health Care Services               |

Staff Present

| <b>Name</b>     |
|-----------------|
| Walter Sujansky |
| Tim Andrews     |
| Peter Hung      |